PLAINTIFFS' MOTION IN LIMINE

Case 2:08-cv-02987-RGK-SH Document 66 Filed 06/26/09 Page 1 of 22

defendants via their counsel, and requested that all evidence be preserved for inspection and/or testing by Plaintiffs' experts.

The Truck belonged to an individual names Luis Garcia. Mr. Garcia was deposed on April 28, 2009. During the deposition, Mr. Garcia testified that the truck was released to him without any instruction to preserve the truck, make the truck available, etc and that Officer Mancha was the Oxnard Police Department representative who he always spoke with regarding the truck. Mr. Garcia further testified that he was contacted by both counsel for Plaintiffs wherein he ws asked whether they could inspect his truck. Mr. Garcia then contacted Officer Mancha who informed Mr. Garcia that he "could do what he wants" with "the truck", that he could "sell it" or "destroy it". Officer Mancha also advised Mr. Garcia that he did not have to speak to anyone, including plaintiffs or their counsel.

Spoliation of evidence is the destruction or alteration of evidence. Although a party need not have acted in ``bad faith" to be held responsible for spoliation of evidence [see Glover v. BIC Corp. (9th Cir 1993) 6 F3d 1318, 1329], a party must have had notice that documents were relevant or potentially relevant to litigation before the documents were destroyed for spoliation of evidence to have occurred [United States ex rel. Aflatooni v. Kitsap Physicians Serv. (9th Cir 2002) 314 F3d 995, 1001; Akiona v. United States (9th Cir 1991) 938 F2d 158, 161].

While a litigant is under no duty to keep or retain every document in its possession once a complaint is filed, it is under a duty to preserve what it knows, or reasonably should know, is relevant in the action, is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, is reasonably likely to be requested during discovery, and/or is the subject of a pending discovery request [National Ass'n of Radiation Survivors v. Turnage (ND Cal 1987) 115 FRD 543, 556–557, citing Wm. T. Thompson Co. v. General Nutrition Corp. (CD Cal 1984) 593 F Supp 1443; see also Zubulake v. UBS Warburg LLC (SDNY 2003) 220 FRD 212, 216].

A range of sanctions is available for spoliation of evidence under the court's inherent powers [see, e.g., Unigard Sec. Ins. Co. v. Lakewood Eng'g & Mfg. Corp. (9th Cir 1992) 982 F2d

27

28

public interest in expeditious resolution of litigation, the court's own need to manage its

dockets, and the public policy favoring disposition of cases on the merits [Leon v. IDX Sys.

363, 369]:

7 8

6

9

10

11 12 13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

Compromised or Destroyed. In the Ninth Circuit, the particular sanction levied under the court's inherent power depends on [see, e.g., Unigard Sec. Ins. Co. v. Lakewood Eng'g & Mfg. Corp. (9th Cir 1992) 982 F2d

25.97[3] Sanction Must Be Commensurate With Degree to Which Evidence Was

- The degree to which the evidence was altered, lost, or destroyed.
- The degree of the responsible party's culpability.
- Surrounding circumstances such as the parties' previous ability to view or test that evidence prior to its spoliation.

When the plaintiff insurer destroyed an electric heater and a boat prior to filing an action against the heater manufacturer for subrogation based on the allegation that the heater cause a fire in the boat, the proper sanction was exclusion of evidence regarding the alleged defect in the heater [see Unigard Sec. Ins. Co. v. Lakewood Eng'g & Mfg. Corp. (9th Cir 1992) 982 F2d 363, 369].

When appropriate, a party that destroyed potential evidence should show that he or she did not do so in response to the litigation, perhaps by indicating that the evidence was destroyed prior to litigation and before the party could have any reasonable indication that litigation would be brought relative to that evidence [see, e.g., Akiona v. United States (9th Cir 1991) 938 F2d 158, 161, cert. denied, 503 US 962 (1992)].

A party should only be penalized for destroying documents if it was wrong to do so, and that requires, at a minimum, some notice that the documents are potentially relevant [Akiona v. United States (9th Cir 1991) 938 F2d 158, 161, cert. denied, 503 US 962 (1992)]. A party should only be penalized for destroying documents if it was wrong to do so, and that requires, at a minimum, some notice that the documents are potentially relevant [Akiona v. United States (9th Cir 1991) 938 F2d 158, 161, cert. denied, 503 US 962 (1992)].

In the case at bar, there was an officer involved shooting resulting in the death of a young individual. The decedent was alleged to have been attempted to break into "the truck", an alleged activity that gave rise to the chase which culminated in the killing of Mr.

Barrera by an Oxnard Police Department. Certainly this set of circumstances would alert even the most simple of administrators that litigation is possible if not probable, and that the truck, and all the contents therein, were relevant to any such litigation.

In fact, both of Plaintiffs counsel, on separate occassions, sent correspondence to Defendants asking them to preserve all evidence. Counsel for Maria Lazos specifically requested access to the truck in correspondence separately addressed to each defendant. Furthermore, Maria Lazos filed a Claim Against Public Entity on October 07, 2009 and the truck was released on October 09, 2009. Therefore, Defendants cannot state that they were unaware of any potential litigation.

The release of the truck to Mr Garcia absent any admonition, request, or without the provision of any other type of caveat or proviso that the truck need be preserved and/or made available to Plaintiffs counsel was clearly done in bad faith and with the intent to deprive plaintiffs of access to the truck. Defendants had both actual and/or constructive knowledge that the truck need be preserved.

In essence, defendants put themselves in the best of circumstances. Defendants abused their status as public entities, especially as law enforcement defendants. There is inherent power in such a status, and Plaintiffs proffer to this Court that because of this fact, defendants should be under a more stringent standard than private parties. Defendants clearly knew that the truck was essential to plaintiffs' case in chief, and furthermore knew and exploited the fact that Luis Garcia, who was the owner of the truck, was afraid of any involvement with this case. Luis Garcia testified that he informed Officer Mancha that he was scared.

Plaintiffs strongly believe that Defendants had a **direct** and **absolute** duty to hold the truck until it was clear that no other party wanted to inspect the truck, and/or the statute of limitations expired. Defendants had specific knowledge that a claim had been filed against them, and that they truck had been specifically delineated in this claim. Even if Defendants were unable to procure possession of said truck for an extensive amount of time (although there is no known reason they could not), they **minimally** had a duty to ask and/or

encourage Luis Garcia to make the truck available to Plaintiffs and/or their counsel. The opposite occurred in this case. Defendants intentionally released the truck expeditiously, and actively encouraged Mr. Garcia to sell and/or destroy the truck. It is for this reason that Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court order the exclusion of any evidence found inside the truck, exclude any evidence of decedent attempting to commit any crimes in the truck, and/or exclude any evidence relating in any way to the truck. LAW OFFICES OF KIM D. SCOVIS DATED: June 26, 2009 Attorneys for Plaintiff LAW OFFICES OF GREGORY A. YATES **DATED**: June 26, 2009 Attorneys for Plaintiff PLAINTIFFS' MOTION IN LIMINE

Exhibit

66 1 99

/EHICLE REPO			se 2:08	3-cv-()298	7-I	RGK-	SH	Docu	ıme	ent 66	File	ed 0	6/2 of	6/09 Pace TE CHP 180 IS FE FICERS BY THE CA	E 8 C	o <mark>f 22</mark> FTO ALL PI CHIGHWAY	EACE (PATROL
EPOT TING DEPARTMENT				LOCATI	эн сор	E DA	TE / TIME	OF REPOR	RT NOTE	CE OE	STORED V	/ENICLE		FILE				
ARD	P.	\mathcal{D}		1560	Pc	I	0.3-0	7/0720	DELIV	VERED	PERSONA	FLEY F	7	0		117	,	
ION TOWED / STOLEN	FROM					OC	OMETER	READING		LEAR	IN SVS?	A YES	סא [/ TIME DISPATCH			
		,					64	80			in sass $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$] NO			.1011, 120	LOGIN	Ų.
IR MAKE			10DEL				PYTPE ()		COLO)R		CENSE NO.			ONE MO	NTH / YEA	i 4.R	STATE
- CHEVY			SILVE	RAD	ω_{-}	<u>L</u> .	7/0		N	117	8	301 HZ	352	2	Two I			CA
ICLE IDENTIFICATION NO	1 10	ı lı	11010	101	115	Z ;	7141	918	ENGI	4E NO			Ĩ	VALU	ATION BY DOFF	ICER	OWNER	<u> </u>
GCDC	1	<u> </u>	1 4	- 2		9	301	7 0	اح	_				<u> </u>	300 🔀 301-4000	4001	· 🗆 🛌	
ſ		RE	GISTERED (DWNER				\neg	Г.	AME A	C D/O		LEG	AL OV			_	
									í ,	INTO E	18 N/U							
									-									
								_	•-									
								/	<u> </u>									
STORED				IMPOU	иDED			KÍ	RELE	ASE)		ſ	RI	ECOVERED - \	/EUICL	FICON	DONEWS
MNG / STORAGE CONCERN	1 (NAME	E, ADE	DRESS PHO	NEi				$-\mathcal{T}$										
./			N5					(GE AUTHORITY / F	REASON	EVER	11.4 CD
VED TO / STORED AT		<u> </u>	-, 1			All	RBAG?				· - · ·	DRIVEAB		44	<u>ss.s(a)</u>	V.(EDME
O STURKTS	S	Œ	OXN	ARI)	CA		7	Ø NO		1	[] ₂	YES	_] ис	JUNK [1,000	VIN SWI	
СОИДІПОИ	YES	T	1		/	NO	IΥ	EMS	7	NO		EMS	YES		TIRES / WHEEL	UNK	YES	
:CKED		X	SEAT (FRO	(זאכ	X		REGISTR	ATION	12	1	CAMPER		1 125	X NO	LEFT FRONT		CONDI	при
ED HULK per 431(c) VC			SEAT (REA	AR)	-	7	ALT. / GE	NERATOR			VESSEL	AS LOAD	ļ -	1	RIGHT FRONT	- X	94.	
ALIZED		Ш	RADIO				BATTERY				FIREARM	s	†		LEFT REAR	_	-VV	
ANS. STRIP		Ш.	TAPE DEC	K			DIFFERE	JAITE			OTHER				RIGHT REAR			
.'S STRIP	1	1	TAPES			-	TRANSM								SPARE	1	10V5	
STEIR THE ASSISTANCE	 		OTHER RA			- 1	AUTOMAT	FIC	1 -						HUB CAPS		10n E	
STRIP per 431(b) VC SE VEHICLE TO	R/O 01		IGNITION R	AGENCY I	<u> </u>	~	27850.31								SPECIAL WHEELS		0110	
DREOF PERSON AUTHOR	RIZING	RELE	ASE	10 NO	4	- 1	0 · 69	-01	SIGNATU	IRE O		INDERSIGN LEO TO TAK TAKING PO	SSES!	SION	EBY CERTIFY THA ION OF THE ABOV	E DESCRI	J GALLY BED VEHIO	CLE
STOLEN VEHICLE / COMPONENT							EMBE	ZZLED	VEHICLE [PL	ATE(S) REPOR	RT.		
/ TIME OF OCCURRENCE				DATE / 7	IME REI	PORT	rED	1	NAME OF	REPO	RTING PAI	RTY (R/P)			Di	RIVER LIC	ENSE NO.	/STATE
																		, orall
RIVER OF VEHICLE DATE / TIME							F	ADDRESS OF R/P						re	ELEPHONE OF RIP			
								SIGNATURE OF PERSON MAKING REPOR						((()			
IFY OR DECLARE UNDER P	ENALT	Y OF F	PERJURY UN	OER THE	LAWS C	F		s	SIGNATUI	RE OF	-		-					
TO GREW ON WAR THAT	7116.1	JAE6		JE AND CO	JKKEGI			REMAR	SK2									
				···						MAGE,	ARRESTS	J						
SNAME				ARREST			17	R	EPORTE	D BY		CAR	RGO / T	YPE?	VA	 LUE \$		
				YES	NO	· 		(<u> </u>	7)		YE\$	NC	· [BILL OF	LADING A	TTACHED
EHICLE 1	W.	ΑĆ	S Rs	51EA	ŚZ		7		77	ίŧ.	R/A	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	M		10-9-0	フィ	Time	
WPS.			· · · · · · ·			<u>-</u> -/						<u> </u>	<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>		10 170	' ! /	144	
<u>,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</u>							-				<u> </u>							
			"" "															
															•			
					•											· · · · · ·		
														<u>.</u>	·			
		_/					1	71	\			-	-	ì				——————————————————————————————————————
2000 (TA	λ <u> </u>		£ 5		Æ				2	1		ij	∌				
FRONT	4 0	/ 	FT SIDE	سر سارة		٦	-(©)	RIGHT S	DE (C		•	C	AR	<u> </u>			,	j
IRE OF OFFICER TAKING RI	EPORT			1.0.	NO.		SUPERV				050	-				TOP		
MANCHA					800	\	1					D NOTICES AL OWNER				·	TE NOTIFI	ED
Free tan							J	 _			L LEG/	- OWNER	o rek	∠∠¢52	VU/	NO		-A- 7 つ
£766																	c183	泉

EP! ~ (ING DEPARTMENT LOCATION CODE DATE / TIME OF REPORT NOTICE OF STORED VEHICLE FILE NO 10 3 07/02 DELIVERED PERSONALLY 25/63 ON TOWED / STOLEN FROM ODOMETER READING VIN CLEAR IN SVS? 🖫 YES 🔲 NO DATE / TIME DISPATCH NOTIFIED LOG NO LIC. CLEAR IN SVS7 4 YES NO MAKE вору туре COLOR LICENSE NO ONE MONTH ! YEAR 775 STATE WHIT <u>CHETA</u> 图 10家 □rwo 12/01 HICLE IDENTIFICATION NO ENGINE NO. VALUATION BY OFFICER OWNER 0-300 🔀 301-4000 🔲 4001 + 🔲 § REGISTERED OWNER LEGAL OVALER SAME AS RIO STORED IMPOUNDED RELEASED RECOVERED - VEHICLE / COMPONENT WING / STORAGE CONCERN (NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE) STORAGE AUTHORITY / REASON CUIDENCE NAVED VED TO / STORED AT 1 21/1 AIRBAG? ORIYEABLE? VIN SWITCHED? YEŞ ГД′ № YES STURGES Q □ 1 7 JUNK ☐YES 🕅 NO CONDITION YES NO ITEMS YES NO ITEMS YES NO ITEMS TIRES / WHEELS YES NO сонытіфи SCKED SEAT (FRONT) REGISTRATION CAMPER LEFT FRONT "NED HULK per 431(c) VC SEAT (REAR) ALT. / GENERATOR VESSEL AS LOAD RIGHT FRONT VDALIZEO RADIO BATTERY FIREARMS LEFT REAR TRANS STRIP TAPE DECK DIFFERENTIAL OTHER RIGHT REAR TS STRIP TAPES TRANSMISSION SPARE 'STAL STRIP OTHER RADIO AUTOMATIC HUB CAPS STRIP per 431(b) VC IGNITION KEY MANUAL SPECIAL WHEELS SE VEHICLE TO R/O OR AGENT AGENCY HOLD 22850 3 VC GARAGE PRINCIPAL / AGENT STORING VEHICLE (SIGNATURE) DATE / TIME : OF PERSON / AGENCY AUTHORIZING RELEASE DATE CERTIFICATION I, THE UNDERSIGNED, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I AM LEGALLY

SEE REVERSE FOR INFORMATION

AUTHORIZED AND ENTITLED TO TAKE POSSESSION OF THE ABOVE DESCRIBED VEHICLE

SIGNATURE OF PERSON TAKING POSSESSION

प्रदेश:

إكرابين بنك

HURE OF PERSON AUTHORIZING PELEASE

NOTICE OF STO	OR EDAS	VEI2tOBE	C(/2 28 928\	7 ∉RGK-S⊦	1 0	Ocur	nei	nt 66	Filed	d 06/	26 of	FICERS BY THE C	ENISHED CALIFORNIA	DALL PEA HIGHWAY I	CE PATROL
ON TOWED / STOLEN ON TOWED / STOLEN R MAKE CHELY IICLE IDENTIFICATION NO		Monei	S604 S 1	DE DATE / TIME OF A COMMETTER RE COMME	<u>/67/</u> ADING	DELIA LIC C LOLO LOLO LOLO LOLO LOLO LOLO LOLO L	EREC LEAR LEAR R	IN SVS? SILIC	YES] он [он [он [OATE	TIME DISPATCH ONE M TIWO TIWO TION BY TOO 300 300 301 301 301	ONTH / YEA	OWNER	STATE
STORED VANG / STORAGE CONCERN		DRESS, PHON	MPOUNDED	,		RELE	NSE	D		[51		ECOVERED -			
MED TO / STURE TO	2 PD			AIRBAG7	√но 1				DRIVEAB		224] NO	<u>50.5(k)</u>	\ <u>\</u> \ <u>\</u> \ <u>\</u>	VIH SWITC	. ∪ € . <u>=1235 </u>
CONDITION COKED HED HULK per 431(c) VC L ALIZED TS STRIP TS STRIP STRIP STRIP per 431(b) VC SE VEHICLE TO	YES NO	SEAT (FRO SEAT (REAL RADIO TAPE DECK TAPES OTHER RAD IGNITION KE	NT) X	NO ITEMS REGISTRATI ALT I GENER BATTERY DIFFERENTIA TRANSMISSI AUTOMATIC MANUAL 22850 3 VC	OH RATOR AL OH		NO PRIN	CAMPER VESSEL A: FIREARMS OTHER	S LOAD		-	TIRES / WHEE LEFT FRONT RIGHT FRONT LEFT REAR RIGHT REAR SPARE HUB CAPS SPECIAL WHEEL (SIGNATURE)	S in	CONDITION OF THE PROPERTY OF T	Би
OF PERSON / AGENCY AUT MANY 12 ORE OF PERSON AUTHOR			ID NO	DATE 10 5 C	_:_L			N I THE UN UND ENTITLE PERSON TA	LUTOTAF	E PUSS	E8\$1	EBY CERTIFY THA ON OF THE ABOY	AT 1713 LEGA VE DESCRIB	EO VEHICLE	

SEE REVERSE FOR INFORMATION

Exhibit

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARIA LAZOS, ET AL.,

PLAINTIFFS,

(PAGES 1-85)

-vs-

CASE NO. CV 08-02987 RGK (SHx)

CITY OF OXNARD, ET AL.,

CONSOLIDATED WITH CASE NO. CV 08-05153 RGK (SH)

DEFENDANTS.

AND CONSOLIDATED ACTION.

DEPOSITION OF LUIS GARCIA
TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 2009, 10:14 A.M.

OUR FILE NO: 090428GAS(1)

REPORTED BY: GINA A. STACY, C.S.R. 7927

1

DEPOSITION OF LUIS GARCIA, TAKEN AT 10:14 A.M., TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 2009, AT 300 EAST ESPLANADE DRIVE, Page 1

- 7 truck?
- 8 A No.
- 9 Q So you don't -- do you know whether fingerprints
- 10 were taken in your truck?
- 11 A I don't know. Because the police -- what they
- 12 did is they took my saliva to check the DNA to see if it
- 13 was on there, if it was mine.
- 14 Q on where?
- 15 A Well, the police department took a test to see
- 16 if -- see if my fingerprints.
- 17 Q On the knife?
- 18 A No. Not on the knife.
- 19 Simply just to -- they did a test on me that they
- 20 wanted to be sure that it wasn't -- because they asked me
- 21 if those things were mine.
- 22 Q Meaning the chisel and the knife?
- 23 A Uh-huh.
- 24 Q So they took saliva from your mouth for DNA?
- 25 A Yes.

우

- 1 Q Mr. Garcia, did anybody at any time between the
- 2 morning of the shooting and to the day that you picked up
- 3 the truck from Mr. Vargas -- did anybody from the city,
- 4 the police, anybody from the government tell you hold on
- 5 to the truck and don't get rid of it.
- 6 A No.
- 7 Q Did anybody tell you from the police department,
- 8 the government, or their attorneys, Mr. DeGenna or other
- 9 people -- did anybody tell you that the Tommy Barrera's
- 10 people wanted the truck?

- 11 A No.
- 12 I was the one that -- I told them that they were
- 13 calling me, they wanted to rent me a car. And I told
- 14 Mr. Mancha, and he said, well, let them take it. He said
- 15 there be wouldn't be any trouble.
- 16 BY MR. DEGENNA:
- 17 Q Who would be in trouble --
- 18 MR. DeGENNA: Misstates his testimony.
- 19 MS. JENNY SCOVIS: I didn't understand his
- 20 testimony.

유

- 21 THE WITNESS: He told me that, if I wanted to
- 22 leave the truck with them, if they wanted to take it,
- 23 that it was my belonging and that they had already
- 24 finished with their investigation.
- 25 BY MS. JENNY SCOVIS:

- 1 Q Who told you that, sir?
- 2 A Luis Mancha. The truck -- I could -- I could
- 3 destroy it or do whatever I wanted with it or use it to
- 4 work. So I didn't want it anymore.
- 5 Q Did somebody -- did Maria Lazos tell you she
- 6 wanted to rent you a truck so she could take the truck
- 7 that was involved that night?
- 8 A I don't know who it was, but they called me.
- 9 Q Somebody called you?
- 10 A Yes. And they told me that they were the
- 11 attorneys.
- 12 Q And they said that they wanted the truck and we
- 13 will rent you another truck meanwhile?
- 14 A Yes. Something like that.

- Depo of Luis Garcia transcript
- 15 Q Okay. Did anybody -- did whoever called you --
- 16 was it somebody from Tommy Barrera's side, young Tommy
- 17 Barrera?
- 18 A Yes. They were attorneys. That is what they
- 19 told me.
- 20 Q The attorneys?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q Okay. Now, did they also offer to buy the truck
- 23 from you?

우

- 24 A No.
- 25 Q Nobody offered to buy it?

- 1 A No.
- 2 Q Now, when you were offered to be given a rental
- 3 car, did you say yes, or no?
- 4 A I told them that I had already sold the truck
- 5 because I had it down in Los Angeles.
- 6 Q That you sold the truck?
- 7 A Yes. I told them that. They can check their
- 8 notes.
- 9 Q Now, did you sell the truck when you told them
- 10 you sold the truck?
- 11 A It was -- the deal was done. It was a business
- 12 deal that we had done, but it was never finished.
- 13 Q So how come it wasn't finished?
- 14 A Because my cousin thought not fixing it -- he
- 15 wanted to paint it and all. But -- rebuild it all, but
- 16 then it was going to be too much money. So he said he
- 17 didn't want it after all.
- 18 Q Did your friend not want it because it was

- 19 involved in the shooting?
- 20 MR. DeGENNA: Calls for speculation.
- 21 THE WITNESS: I don't know. That could be
- 22 possible.

우

- 23 BY MS. JENNY SCOVIS:
- 24 Q Did you, Mr. Garcia, specifically ask Officer
- 25 Mancha what to do with your truck? Is that correct?

- 1 A I asked him.
- 2 Q And when did you ask Officer Mancha what to do
- 3 with the truck?
- 4 MR. DeGENNA: Objection. Misstates his testimony
- 5 as to -- misstating his testimony. He didn't ask him
- 6 what to do with the truck.
- 7 BY MS. JENNY SCOVIS:
- 8 Q Did you talk to Officer Mancha about your truck?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q And did you talk to Officer Mancha about your
- 11 truck before you picked it up from Herman Vargas' lot?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q And when you called Officer Mancha to talk to him
- 14 about your truck before it got picked up from Mr. Vargas,
- 15 what did you ask Officer Mancha as well as you can
- 16 remember?
- 17 A That if I could sell it or destroy it. And he
- 18 told me yes.
- 19 Q That you could sell it or destroy it?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Well, first I took it to Los Angeles. I was
- 22 going to sell it. But they didn't want it. So I had to

- 23 destroy it.
- 24 Q Who didn't want it sold?
- 25 A My cousin.

70

- 1 Q Did the police care whether you sold it or
- 2 destroyed it?
- 3 MR. DeGENNA: Objection. Calls for speculation.
- 4 BY MS. JENNY SCOVIS:
- 5 Q That you know of.
- 6 Go ahead and answer.
- 7 A No. No because they told me that it was my
- 8 vehicle.
- 9 Q And that is what Officer Mancha said, in fact --
- 10 it's your vehicle, do what you want?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Okay. Thank you.
- 13 Now -- and that was before you picked it up from
- 14 Mr. Vargas?
- 15 A Yes. But that it -- if I wasn't going to need it
- 16 back or whatever, what would I do with it.
- 17 Q Who said that?
- 18 A Well, I thought. That is why I asked if I
- 19 could --
- 20 Q If you could what?
- 21 A Get rid of it. Sell it or trash it.
- 22 Q Mr. Garcia, was that the only conversation that
- 23 you had with anybody from the police department regarding
- 24 your truck --
- 25 A Yes.

71

Ŷ

- 8 was -- I went with them. It was about the truck to -- I
- 9 wanted to know when they would give it to me or what they
- 10 were going to do. And I asked them.
- 11 And they told me you could use it to work. If
- 12 there is any trouble, you could just call or come in if
- 13 anything is bothering you or whatever. But I didn't want
- 14 it anymore.
- 15 Q So you -- did you express to Officer Mancha some
- 16 worry that there may be trouble from the -- Tomas Barrera
- 17 and the Cholos?
- 18 A I told him.
- 19 Q And you told him that -- was that after Tomas
- 20 Barrera came to see you and tell you that he has the --
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q Okay. And besides Tomas Barrera -- I can't
- 23 pronounce anybody's name today.
- 24 MS. KIM SCOVIS: Barrera.
- 25 BY MS. JENNY SCOVIS:

74

- 1 Q Barrera.
- 2 Did other Cholos come to see you about the truck?
- 3 A No.

우

- 4 Q You were just -- you had some worry in the back
- 5 of your mind that it might be trouble?
- 6 A Yes. That is why I never left it on the street.
- 7 Q Okay. I understand.
- 8 Was there talk that you're aware of after the
- 9 shooting that somebody called the police to tell them
- 10 that somebody was breaking into the truck?
- 11 A No.

- 12 Q Do you know whether there was a call -- do you
- 13 think there was a call to the police to tell them that
- 14 somebody was messing with the truck?
- 15 A No.
- 16 Q And you never called the police to say anything
- 17 about the truck; is that correct?
- 18 A No.
- 19 Q No.
- Now, when you told Officer Mancha and his
- 21 companion that you had the worries that we just talked
- 22 about, what did they tell you to do?
- 23 A That there wasn't any problem. If anybody
- 24 bothered me, to just call the police department.
- 25 Q Did Officer Mancha or anybody else in the police

75

- 1 department ever tell you that the lawyers representing
- 2 Tommy's mother Maria Lazos or Tomas Barrera wanted the
- 3 truck to look at?
- 4 MR. DeGENNA: Objection. Asked and answered.
- 5 THE WITNESS: No. No. I was the one that told
- 6 them that.

우

- 7 BY MS. JENNY SCOVIS:
- 8 Q Okay. So when you told them that, what did they
- 9 tell you to do?
- 10 A That it was my vehicle. I could do whatever I
- 11 wanted with it. That they no longer needed it. They had
- 12 already done what they had to do. So if I wanted to lend
- 13 it to anybody or sell it, it wouldn't be any problem.
- 14 Q Okay. Did they ever advise you to make the truck
- 15 available to Tommy's people?

Page 66

- 16 A No. No. They never told me.
- 17 Q And the reverse. Did they ever tell you to not
- 18 make the truck available to Tommy's people?
- 19 A No. No.
- 20 MS. JENNY SCOVIS: Just one moment, and I may be
- 21 done.
- 22 Q Did your cousin ever have a collision with that
- 23 truck?

우

- 24 A No.
- 25 Q There was no car accident with the truck?

- 1 A No.
- Q Was that something you told Maria Lazos?
- 3 A The about accidents? No. No. I don't remember.
- 4 About accidents? No. Because only thing that they
- 5 called me, and I told them that I had scrapped it.
- 6 Q Scrapped it meaning you smashed it; right?
- 7 A (Indicating.)
- 8 Q Okay. That's very descriptive.
- 9 Did Maria Lazos -- when she called you, did she
- 10 ask you to talk to her lawyer, me?
- 11 A I believe so. I don't remember. I didn't speak
- 12 much with -- well --
- 13 Q You just wanted out of all this mess; right?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q By the way, do you still live in the same area
- 16 that you lived at the time of the shooting?
- 17 A If I live at the same what?
- 18 Q Area of Oxnard.
- 19 A Yes. Almost on the corner. On the other side. Page 67

PROOF OF SERVICE

I am employed in the county of Ventura, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within action, and my business address is: Law Offices of Kim D. Scovis, 223 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd., Suite 412, Thousand Oaks, CA 91360.

On June 26, 2009, I served the following document(s):

PLAINTIFFS MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 12 TO EXCLUDE ANY EVIDENCE FOUND IN THE TRUCK BELONGING TO LUIS GARCIA

on the interested parties in this action by placing a true and correct copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

Law Office of Alan E. Wistosky
Attention: Mr. Dirk DeGenna
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 1500
Oxnard, CA 93036

Law Office of Gregory A. Yates, P.C. Attn: Gregory Yates 16830 Ventura Blvd., #250 Encino, CA 91436

Daniel C. Morgan & Assoc. 1591 Spinnaker Doctor., #205 Ventura, CA 93001

<u>X</u>

I am readily familiar with the business' practice for collection and processing of correspondence and mailing with the United States Postal Service; such correspondence would be deposited with the United States Postal Service the same day of deposit in the ordinary course of business. I know that the envelope was sealed and, with postage thereon fully prepaid, placed for collection and mailing on this date, following ordinary business practices, in the United States mail at Thousand Oaks, California.

Fed Ex overnight service.

By Personal Service, I caused such envelope to be delivered by hand to the above address(es).

By facsimile, I caused such document to be transmitted via facsimile machine, to the above address(es)

(State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

X	(Federal) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar
	of this court at whose direction the service was made.
	Executed on June 26, 2009, at Thousand Oaks, California
	Ω
	Roschelle Ayonayon

PROOF OF SERVICE

Case 2:08-cv-02987-RGK-SH Document 66 Filed 06/26/09 Page 22 of 22